

Notice of Allowability

Application No.

10/826,565

Examiner

Elizabeth Robinson

Applicant(s)

ANDREWS, JOHN W.

Art Unit

1773

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. **THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS.** This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.

1. ☒ This communication is responsive to communications filed on 16 April 2004.
2. ☒ The allowed claim(s) is/are 1-19, 35- 65, 85-89.
3. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of the:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* Certified copies not received: _____.

Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application.
THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.

4. ☐ A SUBSTITUTE OATH OR DECLARATION must be submitted. Note the attached EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT or NOTICE OF INFORMAL PATENT APPLICATION (PTO-152) which gives reason(s) why the oath or declaration is deficient.
5. ☐ CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted.
 - (a) ☐ including changes required by the Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) attached
 - 1) ☐ hereto or 2) ☐ to Paper No./Mail Date _____.
 - (b) ☐ including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.

Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).
6. ☐ DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.

Attachment(s)

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3. ☒ Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08),
Paper No./Mail Date 10-23-2006
4. ☐ Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit
of Biological Material
5. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6. ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413),
Paper No./Mail Date 20061120, 20061120A
7. ☒ Examiner's Amendment/Comment
8. ☒ Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance
9. ☐ Other _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1 through 19, 35 through 65, and 85 through 89, drawn to coated particles and the coating solution, classified in class 428, subclass 403.
- II. Claims 20 through 34, drawn to nanoparticles and the process of making them, classified in class 423, subclass 582.
- III. Claims 66 through 84 and 90 through 101, drawn to a method of using the coating solution, classified in class 427, subclass 212.

The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed produce two materially different products. While the process for making the products is similar, one product is a clear solution and the other is nanoparticles. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the

Art Unit: 1773

process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, the solution can be used in two different processes. It can be used both to increase the refractive index of a substrate or as a protective topcoat for a substrate.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result**

Art Unit: 1773

in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

During a telephone conversation with Geza Ziegler on November 14, 2006, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1 through 19, 35 through 65, and 85 through 89. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 20 through 34, 66 through 84, and 90 through 101 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided

Art Unit: 1773

by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Geza Ziegler on November 20, 2006.

The application has been amended as follows:

Claims 20 through 34, 66 through 84, and 90 through 101 are cancelled.

In line 3 of claim 4, there should be a comma between selenium and tin.

In line 1 of each of ^{original} claims 47 through 49, the wording "claim 35" should be replaced with "claim 46".

In line 1 of ^{original} claim 57, the wording "claim 28" should be replaced with "claim 35".

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1 through 19, 35 through 65, and 85 through 89 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: None of the references of record teach or suggest the method of claim 1. Other similar prior art methods result in a yellow colored solution, due to differences in specified pH range or differences in the controlled heating methodology. All other allowable claims are dependent to claim 1.

The following references are made of record as detailing the closest prior art to the above claim:

U.S. Patent 6,429,169 discloses a method of making a yellow anatase titanium oxide sol. The pH range of the sol is 7.5 to 9.5, which is higher than the range of 4 to

Art Unit: 1773

6.5 specified in claim 1 of the instant case. There is no mention of increasing the amount of peroxide used to modify the pH to this range.

U.S. Patent 6,344,277 discloses a method of making a yellow amorphous type titanium peroxide coating. The solution produced is not colorless, and while it mentions heating the solution, it does not mention or suggest the controlled heating of claim 1 to produce a colorless solution.

U.S. Patent 6,884,752 discloses a titanium peroxide sol where the yellow color is diminished by the addition of a wetting agent that allows a thinner film. It does not mention or suggest the controlled heating of claim 1 to produce a colorless solution.

U.S. Patent 5,403,513 discloses an anatase titanium oxide sol. This sol is either yellow or translucent in its various embodiments and requires the addition of an additional inorganic compound to be stable. The solution produced is not colorless, and while it mentions heating the solution, it does not mention or suggest the controlled heating of claim 1 to produce a colorless solution.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elizabeth Robinson whose telephone number is 571-

Art Unit: 1773

272-7129. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 8 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carol Chaney can be reached on 571-272-1284. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ear

ear


CAROL CHANEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER